



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Admitting that it develops the scientist in the man, it may reasonably be asked: What becomes of the man in the scientist? Dr. James has said some pretty things about the part which the state university can play in raising the standard of citizenship through the influence of the graduates whom it turns back into the world each year. Surely he can not think that that man makes the best citizen whose university training has been conducted solely along the lines of professional efficiency. The student of the classics, of literature in general, or of philosophy cuts a sorry figure if he is wholly ignorant of science; but his plight is not so sad as that of the scientist to whom literature and philosophy are as closed books. Even in highly specialized scientific training the aim should be not so much to produce specialists who are men as men who are specialists.

M. INGRES ON THE VALUE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

It is surprising that the introduction of successive editions of so good a book as Professor Maxime Ingres' *Cours complet de langue française* should be disfigured by a gratuitous assault upon classical studies. Professor Ingres has a wide reputation as a teacher, and is said to know French as only a Frenchman can know it. But why should he put himself on record in such a diatribe as this? Classical teachers, however, while deploring the attitude of mind which regards depreciation of other courses as necessary to the appreciation of one's own, will on the whole be extremely grateful to M. Ingres for having, by his peculiar method of argument, added to the gayety of nations.

He begins by stating that the "hierophants of Greek and Latin" base their case upon three arguments: (1) that the study of Greek and Latin affords the best mental drill; (2) that it contributes to exact knowledge of one's mother-tongue; and (3) that intercourse with the ancients "forms the mind and heart." As a mere preliminary to his attack upon these three positions M. Ingres disposes of Greek, giving all Hellenic culture its quietus in one or two sentences. "Greek," he says, "is out of the question, for the simple reason that nobody ever learns it. Any college graduate will serve as a proof." He then proceeds to the annihilation of Latin under the three heads given. So far as the value of the drill is concerned, he says that "flexions, declensions, and conjugations constitute a formidable bar-

rier," and "the substance is so deeply buried beneath the form that all the energies of an average student are wanted in the arduous work of clearing." M. Ingres fails to grasp the fact that the very difficulties to which he refers constitute one of the chief elements in the disciplinary value of the study. He adds that the argument based upon the value of Latin as a means of drill may be stated thus: "Classical studies are *useful because they are useless*." By what mental process M. Ingres was able to arrive at this summary is left for our readers to determine.

In his discussion under the second head we have some more pedagogical morsels of rare sweetness; e.g.: "There is no language which is not best studied by itself." This theme, however, M. Ingres feels to be too stirring for calm statement. We are treated to a series of rhetorical questions. "Did Homer know Aryan? Did Cicero know the origin of Latin? Did M^{me} de Sévigné know Greek?" The sentence, "The argument drawn from etymologies is a joke," only serves to give us some idea of the keenness of M. Ingres' sense of humor. Strong confirmatory evidence along the same lines is furnished by the following: "For a writer it is not more useful to know the etymology of the words he uses than it is for a painter to know when, where, and how the colors of his palette were made, and to what special breed belonged the pig which furnished the bristles of his brush."

But it is in his discussion of the moral effect of classical studies that M. Ingres is most instructive. His righteous indignation knows no bounds. He quotes Bastiat's statement that the Romans were a "nation of brigands and slaves," and he adds his own belief that "both their history and their literature are full of facts to justify such a judgment." But he puts the matter more concretely, and in the promiscuous image-smashing which follows not even the venerable Cato escapes. "Was Cato," M. Ingres asks, "a generous and manly man? Was Cicero a model of humility? Is Caesar trustworthy? Does he not boast of having made money by selling one million Gauls as slaves? Did not Virgil accept money, and can he serve as a model of a disinterested man or of a courtier?"

But let us not despair. In his conclusion M. Ingres says that he does not favor the total abolition of the classics. We are saved.